



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/292,862	04/16/1999	MICHAEL A. WALTER	07540/020003	4110

7590

03/24/2003

KRISTINA BIEKER-BRADY PH D  
CLARK & EBING LLP  
176 FEDERAL STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

TURNER, SHARON L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/292,862

Applicant(s)

WALTER ET AL.

Examiner

Sharon L. Turner

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-22 and 27-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 18-32 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed 12-27-02 has been entered into the record and has been fully considered. Claims 18-32 are pending.

### **Election/Restriction**

2. Applicants election of Group II, claims 18-22 and 27-32 to the extent of peptide therapy and glaucoma, without traverse in Paper No. 23 is acknowledged
3. Claims 23-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 23.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Figure 2 lacks full sequence compliance because the brief description only references the nucleic acids of SEQ ID NO:1. However, the amino acids of SEQ ID NO:2 are also represented in the figure. The figure legend should be amended to reference the amino acid sequence represented in the figure.

Appropriate correction is required.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which

it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 18-22 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

The specification discloses SEQ ID NO's: 1 and 2 that corresponds respectively to the cDNA nucleotide sequence and the amino acid sequence of a particular human FREAC3 as disclosed in Figure 2. These SEQ ID NO's meet the written description provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, the claims are directed to and encompass any means for increasing FREAC3 biological activity including administration peptides that are allelic variants or corresponding sequences from other species, mutated sequences, splice variants or wild-type sequences as encompassed by the generic recitation of FREAC3 and as defined in p. 7-9, for example including "wild type FREAC3". None of these sequences or other means for increasing FREAC3 biological activity appear to meet the written description requirement. The instant disclosure of a single polypeptide, that of SEQ ID NO:2 does not adequately support the scope of the claimed FREAC3 genus, which encompasses a substantial variety of subgenera. Moreover the description does not provide for a means of "increasing FREAC3 biological activity". A genus claim may be supported by a representative number of species as set forth in *Regents of the University of California v Eli Lilly & Co*, 119F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997), which states:

Art Unit: 1647

"To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention". Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1980) ("[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed.") Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. Fiers v. Revel, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." Id at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606."

A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs, defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus, or of a recitation of structural features common to the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. The instant specification discloses, however, a single isolated polypeptide sequence SEQ ID NO: 2 and no other amino acid sequences that are proposed to possess FREAC3 biological activity.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that, "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought,

he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

With the exception of SEQ ID NO's:1 and 2 of the instant application, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed nucleic and amino acid sequences and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The specific nucleic and amino acids are required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes v. Baird*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only SEQ ID NO's:1 and 2, but not the full breadth of claims meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

7. Claims 18-22 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the sequences of SEQ ID NO:1 and 2 which describe a FREAC3 gene product, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of increasing the FREAC3 biological activity in a mammal diagnosed as

Art Unit: 1647

having developmental defect or a disease of the eye via administration of any particular compound or via any particular polypeptide. The specification discloses particular FREAC3 mutations that occur in patients with anterior segment dysgenesis and glaucoma, see in particular p.43-45. However, the treatment of a developmental defect or a disease of the eye is not apparently provided. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specifications disclosure is insufficient to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention as broadly claimed without undue experimentation. The factors relevant to this discussion include the quantity of experimentation necessary, the lack of working examples, the unpredictability of the art, the lack of sufficient guidance in the specification and the breadth of the claims.

Applicants claims are directed to increasing FREAC3 biological activity in a mammal. However, the specification fails to delineate the particular biological activities that are to be increased or those mechanisms or means of achieving such increases. While claim 27 is apparently drawn to achieving such via administration of a wild-type FREAC3 polypeptide and pharmaceutical carrier, the specific peptide sequence of such molecule is not disclosed and the specification fails to provide any exemplification of peptide administration that provides for the treatment of a developmental defect or disease of the eye.

In addition, the claims are akin to a single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means and is

Art Unit: 1647

subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph because the specification at most would only disclose those means known to the inventor at the time of the invention, see in particular MPEP 2164.08(a). In the instant case the breadth of means may be via any molecule or method that achieved increased FREAC3 biological activity. Yet the specification fails to delineate what that activity is or any means for increasing it. Further, the specification fails to delineate any particular treatment that provides for any beneficial effect in developmental disorders or diseases of the eye. Thus, the scope of enablement is not commensurate in scope with the claims.

In view of the quantity of experimentation necessary, the lack of working examples, the unpredictability of the art, the lack of sufficient guidance in the specification and the breadth of the claims, it would take undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
9. Claims 18-22 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitations of a "FREAC3", "wild-type FREAC3" and "FREAC3 biological activity" are indefinite terms to the skilled artisan as the claims do not structurally define the products such that the skilled artisan can recognize, test for, make or use the desired sequences or achieve the desired results. In the absence of a structural or



Art Unit: 1647

functional clarification of "FREAC3", "wild-type FREAC3" and "FREAC3 biological activity" the skilled artisan cannot discern the metes and bounds of the claims.

### **Status of Claims**

10. No claims are allowed.

11. The following prior art of record is noted, Mears et al., Autosomal dominant iridogoniodysgenesis anomaly maps to 6p25, Am J. of Hum. Genetics, 59(1):1321-1327, 1996.

12. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this general application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Should applicant wish to FAX a response, the current FAX number for Group 1600 is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (703) 308-4623.

Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D.  
March 21, 2003

  
**GARY KUNZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**